THE

Bishop of *BANG*'s

LATE

SERMON,

AND HIS

LETTER to Dr. SNAPE *in Defence of it,*

ANSWER'D.

And the Dangerous Nature of some Doctrines in his *Preservative,*

Set forth in a

Letter to his Lordship.

By *WILLIAM LAW*, M.A.

The SEVENTH EDITION.

LONDON,

Printed for W. and J. INNYS, at the *Prince's Arms* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. 1718.

Price Six Pence.

BIBLIOTHECA·BODLEIANA·

My Lord,

THAT your Lordship may be prepar'd to receive what I here presume to lay before you, with the greater Candor, I sincerely profess, that it does not proceed from any Prejudice; but from certain Reasons, upon which I find my self invincibly oblig'd to differ from your Lordship in Opinion.

To prevent all Suspicion of my designing any thing injurious to your Lordship's Character, in this Address I have prefix'd, what otherwise I should have chosen to conceal, my Name to it.

Your Lordship is represented as at the Head of a Cause, where every Adversary is sure to be reproach'd, either as a furious Jacobite, or Popish Bigot, as an Enemy to the Liberty of his Country and the Protestant Cause. These hard Names are to be expected, my Lord, from a Set of Men who dishonour your Lordship with their Panegyricks upon your Performances; whose Praises defile the Character they would adorn.

When Dr. *Snape* represents your Lordship as no Friend to the good Orders, and necessary Institutions of the Church, you complain of the ill Arts of an Adversary, who sets you out in false Colours, perverts your Words on purpose to encrease his own *Imaginary Tri-*

people. But, my Lord, in this, Dr. *Snape* only thinks with those who would be counted your Best Friends; and would no longer be your Friends, but that they conclude, you have declar'd against the Authority of the Church. Does your Lordship suppose, that the *T——ds*, the *H——ks*, the *B——ts*, would be at so much Expence of Time and Labour, to justifie, commend and enlarge upon your Lordship's Notions, if they did not think you engaged in their Cause? There is not a Libertine, or Loose-Thinker in *England*, but he imagines you intend to dissolve the Church as a *Society*, and are ready to offer Incence to your Lordship for so meritorious a Design. It is not my Intention to reproach your Lordship with their Esteem, or to involve you in the Guilt of their Schemes; but to shew, that an Adversary does not need any Malice to make him believe you no Friend to the Constitution of the Church, as a Regular Society, since your greatest Admirers every Day publish it by necessary Construction to the World in Print.

After a Word or two concerning a Passage in your Lordship's *Preservative*, I shall proceed to consider your Answer to Dr. *Snape*. In the 98*th* Page you have these Words: *But when you are secure of your Integrity before God,—— this will lead you (as it ought all of us) not to be afraid of the Terrors of Men, or the vain Words of Regular and Uninterrupted Successions, Authoritative Benedictions, Excommunications,—— Nullity, or Validity of God's Ordinances to the People upon Account of Niceties and Trifles, or any other the like Dreams.*

My

My Lord, thus much must be imply'd here: Be not afraid of the Terrors of Men, who would perſuade you of the Danger of being in this, or that Communion, and fright you into particular Ways of worſhipping God, who would make you believe ſuch Sacraments, and ſuch Clergy, are neceſſary to recommend you to his Favour. But theſe, your Lordſhip affirms, we may contemn, if we be but ſecure of our Integrity.

So that if a Man be not a *Hypocrite*, it matters not what Religion he is of. This is a Propoſition of an unfriendly Aſpect to Chriſtianity; But that it is intirely your Lordſhip's, is plain from what you declare p. 90. *Thus every one may find it in his own Conduct to be true, that his Title to God's Favour cannot depend upon his actual being or continuing in any particular Method; but upon his real Sincerity in the Conduct of his Conſcience.* Again, p. 91. *The Favour of God follows Sincerity, conſider'd as ſuch, and conſequently equally follows every equal Degree of Sincerity.* So that, I hope, I have not wreſted your Lordſhip's Meaning, by ſaying, that according to theſe Notions, if a Man be not a Hypocrite, it matters not what Religion he is of. Not only ſincere *Quakers*, *Ranters*, *Muggletonians*, and *Fifth Monarchy-Men*, are as much in the Favour of God, as any of the Apoſtles; but likewiſe ſincere *Jews*, *Turks* and *Deiſts*, are upon as good a Bottom, and as ſecure of the Favour of God, as the ſincereſt Chriſtian.

For your Lordſhip ſaith, it is Sincerity, as ſuch, that procures the Favour of God. If it be Sincerity, as ſuch, then it is Sincerity independent and excluſive of any particular Way of Worſhip: And if *the Favour of God equally follows* every equal *Degree* of *Sincerity*, then it is impoſſible there ſhould be any Difference, either as to Merit or Happineſs, between a ſincere *Believer* and a ſincere *Perſecutor*; and he that burns the Chriſtian, if he be but in earneſt, has the ſame Title to a Reward for it, as he that is burnt for believing in Chriſt.

Your Lordſhip ſaith, you can't help it, if People will charge you with * *Evil Intentions* and *Bad Views*. I intend no ſuch Charge: But I wonder, your Lordſhip ſhould think it hard, that any one ſhould infer from theſe Places, that you *are againſt the Intereſt of the Church of* England.

For, my Lord, cannot the *Quakers*, *Muggletonians*, *Deiſts*, *Presbyterians*, aſſert you as much in their Intereſt as we can? Have you ſaid any thing for us, or done any thing for us in this *Preſervative*, but what you have equally done for them? Your Lordſhip is ours, as you fill a Biſhoprick; but we are at a loſs to diſcover from this Diſcourſe what other Intereſt we have in your Lordſhip: For you openly expoſe our Communion, and give up all the Advantages of it, by telling all ſorts of People, if they are but ſincere in their own way, they are as much in God's Favour as any

---

* *Anſwer*, p. 46.

body

body else. Is this supporting our Interest, my Lord?

Suppose a Friend of King *George* should declare it to all *Britains* whatever, that tho' they were divided into Five Thousand different Parties, to set up different Pretences; yet if they were but Sincere in their Designs, they would be as much in the Favour of God, as those who are most firmly attached to his Majesty. Does your Lordship think, such a one would be thought any great Friend to the Government? And, my Lord, is not this the Declaration you made as to the Church of *England*? Have you not told all Parties, that their Sincerity is enough? Have you said so much as one Word in Recommendation of our Communion: Or, if it was not for your Church-Character in the Title-Page of this Discourse, could any one alive conceive what Communion you was of? Nay, a Reader, that was a Stranger, would imagine, that he who will allow no Difference between Communions, is himself of no Communion. Your Lordship, for ought I know, may act according to the strictest Sincerity, and may think it your Duty to undermine the Foundations of the Church. I am only surprized, that you should refuse to own the Reasonableness of such a Charge. Your Lordship hath cancell'd all our Obligations to any particular Communion, upon pretence of *Sincerity*.

I

I hope, my Lord, there is Mercy in Store for all Sorts of People, however erroneous in their Way of Worshipping God; but cannot believe, that to be a sincere Christian, is to be no more in the Favour of God, than to be a sincere *Deist*, or a sincere *Destroyer* of Christians. It will be allowed, that Sincerity is a necessary Principle of True Religion; and that without it, all the most specious Appearances of Vertue are nothing worth. But still, neither common Sence, nor plain Scripture, will suffer me to think, that when our Saviour was on Earth, they were as much in the Favour of God, who sincerely refused to be his Disciples, and sincerely called for his Crucifixion, as those who sincerely left all and followed him. If they were, my Lord, where is that Blessedness of Believing so often mentioned in the Scripture? Or, where is the Happiness of the Gospel-Revelation, if they are as well, who refuse it sincerely, as those who embrace it with Integrity?

Our Saviour declared, that those who believed, should be saved; but those who believed not, should be damned. Will your Lordship say, that all Unbelievers were insincere; or, that tho' they were damned, they were yet in the same Favour with God, as those who were saved?

The Apostle assures us, that *there is no other Name under Heaven given unto Men, whereby they can be saved, but* Jesus Christ. But your Lordship hath found out an Atonement, more universal than that of his Blood; and which will even make those blessed and happy, who

count it an *unholy Thing*. For seeing it is *Sincerity, as such*, that alone recommends us to the Favour of God, they who sincerely persecute this Name, are in as good a Way, as those that sincerely worship it. Has God declared this to be the only Way to Salvation? How can your Lordship tell the World, that Sincerity will save them, be they in what Way they will? Is this all the Necessity of Christ's Satisfaction? Is this all the Advantage of the Gospel-Covenant, that those who sincerely contemn it, are in as good a State without it, as those that embrace it?

My Lord, here is no Aggravation of your Meaning. If Sincerity, as such, be the only thing that recommends us to God, and every equal Degree of it procures an equal Degree of Favour; it is a Demonstration, that Sincerity *against* Christ is as pleasing to God, as Sincerity *for* him. My Lord, this is a Doctrine which no Words can enough decry. So I shall leave it, to consider what Opinion St. *Paul* had of this kind of Sincerity. He did not think, when he persecuted the Church, tho' he did it *ignorantly*, and in Unbelief, and out of Zeal towards God, that he was as much in the Favour of God, as when he suffer'd for Christ. *I am the least*, saith he, *of the Apostles, not fit to be called an Apostle; because I persecuted the Church of Christ*. The Apostle does not scruple to charge himself with Guilt, notwithstanding his Sincerity.

A little Knowledge of Human Nature will teach us, that our Sincerity may be often charged with Guilt; not as if we were guilty because we are ſincere; but becauſe it may be our Fault that we are hearty and ſincere in ſuch or ſuch ill-grounded Opinions. It may have been from ſome ill Conduct of our own, ſome Irregularities, or Abuſe of our Faculties, that we conceive things as we do, and are fix'd in ſuch or ſuch Tenets. And can we think ſo much owing to a *Sincerity* in Opinions, contracted by ill Habits and guilty Behaviour? There are ſeveral faulty Ways, by which People may cloud and prejudice their Underſtandings, and throw themſelves in a very odd Way of thinking; for ſome Cauſe or other *God may ſend them a ſtrong Deluſion, that they ſhould believe a Lie.* And will your Lordſhip ſay, that thoſe who are thus ſunk into Errors, it may be, through their own ill Conduct, or as a Judgment of God upon them, are as much in his Favour, as thoſe that love and adhere to the Truth? This, my Lord, is a ſhocking Opinion, and has given Numbers of Chriſtians great Offence, as contradicting common Sence and plain Scripture; as ſetting all Religion upon the Level as to the Favour of God.

The next Thing, that according to your Lordſhip, *we ought not to be concern'd at, is vain Words of Regular, and Uninterrupted Succeſſions, as Niceties, Trifles and Dreams.* Thus much ſurely, is imply'd in theſe Words; that no kind of *Ordination*, or *Miſſion* of the Clergy, is of any Conſequence or Moment to us. For if

the

the Ordination need not be Regular, or derived from those who had Authority from Christ to Ordain, it is plain, that no particular kind of Ordination can be of any more Value than another. For no Ordination whatever, can have any worse Defects, than as being Irregular, and not derived by a Succession from Christ. So that if these Circumstances are to be look'd on as *Trifles* and *Dreams*; all the Difference that can be supposed betwixt any Ordinations, comes under the same Notion of Trifles and Dreams; and consequently, are either Good alike, or Trifling alike. So that *Quakers*, *Independents*, *Presbyterians*, according to your Lordship, have as much Reason to think their Teachers as useful to them, and as True Ministers of Christ, as those of the Episcopal Communion have to think their Teachers. For if Regularity of Ordination, and Uninterrupted Succession be mere Trifles, and nothing; then all the Difference betwixt us and other Teachers, must be nothing: For they can differ from us in no other respects. So that, my Lord, if Episcopal Ordination, deriv'd from Christ, hath been contended for by the Church of *England*, your Lordship hath in this Point deserted her: And you not only give up Episcopal Ordination, by ridiculing a Succession; but likewise by the same Argument exclude any *Ministers* on Earth from having Christ's Authority. For if there be not a Succession of Persons authoriz'd from Christ to send others to act in his Name, then both Episcopal and Presbyterian Teachers are equally *Usurpers*, and as mere *Lay-men* as any at all. For there can't be any

other Difference between the Clergy and Laity; but as the one hath Authority derived from Christ, to perform Offices which the other hath not. But this Authority can be no otherwise had, than by an Uninterrupted Succession of Men from Christ, empower'd to qualifie others. For if the Succession be once broke, People must either go into the Ministry of their own Accord, or be sent by such as have no more Power to send others, than to go themselves. And, my Lord, can these be called Ministers of Christ, or received as his Ambassadors? Can they be thought to act in his Name, who have no Authority from him? If so, your Lordship's Servant might Ordain and Baptize to as much purpose as your Lordship: For it could only be objected to such Actions, that they had no Authority from Christ. And if there be no Succession of Ordainers from him, every one is equally qualified to Ordain. My Lord, I should think, it might be granted me, that the Administring of a Sacrament is an Action we have no right to perform, consider'd either as Men, Gentlemen, or Scholars, or Members of a Civil Society. Who then can have any Authority to interpose, but he that has it from Christ? And how that can be had from him, without a Succession of Men from him, is not easily conceiv'd. Should a Private Person choose a Lord Chancellor, and declare his Authority good; would there be any thing but Absurdity, Impudence and Presumption in it? But why he cannot as well commission a Person to act, sign and seal in the King's Name,

Name, as in the Name of Christ, is unaccountable.

My Lord, it is a plain an obvious Truth, that no Man, or Number of Men, consider'd as such, can any more make a Priest, or commission a Person to officiate in Christ's Name, *as such*, than he can enlarge the Means of Grace, or add a New Sacrament for the Conveyance of Spiritual Advantages. The Ministers of Christ are as much positive *Ordinances*, as the Sacraments; and we might as well think, that Sacraments not instituted by him, might be Means of Grace, as those pass for his Ministers, who have no Authority from him.

Once more, all things are either in common in the Church of Christ, or they are not. If they are, then every one may Preach, Baptize, Ordain, *&c.* If all things are not thus common, but the Administring of the Sacrament, and Ordination, *&c.* are Offices appropriated to particular Persons; then I desire to know, how in this present Age, or any other since the Apostles, Christians can know their respective Duties, or what they may, or may not do, with respect to the several Acts of Church-Communion, if there be no *Uninterrupted Succession* of Authorized Persons from Christ: For till Authority from Christ appears, to make a Difference between them, we are all alike; and any one may officiate as well as another. To make a Jest therefore of the *Uninterrupted Succession*, is to make a Jest of Ordination; to destroy the sacred Character, and make all Pretenders to it, as good as those that are sent by Christ.

If there be no *Uninterrupted Succeſſion*, then there are no Authoriz'd Miniſters from Chriſt; if no ſuch Miniſters, then no Chriſtian Sacraments; if no Chriſtian Sacraments, then no Chriſtian Covenant, whereof the Sacraments are the Stated and Viſible Seals.

My Lord, this is all your own. Here are no Conſequences palm'd upon you; but the firſt, plain, and obvious Sence of your Lordſhip's Words,——— And yet, after all, your Lordſhip asks Dr. *Snape*, Why all theſe *Outcries* againſt you * ? Indeed, my Lord, you have only taken the main Supports of our Religion away: You have neither left us Prieſts, nor Sacraments, nor Church: Or, what is the ſame thing, you have made them all *Triſles* and *Dreams*. And what has your Lordſhip given us in the room of all theſe Advantages? Why, only *Sincerity*: This is the great Univerſal Atonement for all. This is that, which, according to your Lordſhip, will help us to the Communion of Saints hereafter, though we are in Communion with any body, or no body here.

The next Thing we are not to be afraid of, are, *the Vain Words of Nullity and Validity of God's Ordinances, i. e.* whether they are adminiſtred by a Clergyman or a Lay-man. This indeed, I have ſhewn, was included in what you ſaid about the Trifle of *Uninterrupted Succeſſion*. But, for fear we ſhould have over-look'd

---

* *Anſwer*, p. 40.

it

it there, you have given it us in expreſs Words in the next Line.

Your Lordſhip tells Dr: *Snape*, That *you know no Confuſion*, Glorious or Inglorious, *that you have endeavoured to introduce* into the Church †.

My Lord, if I may preſume to repeat your own Words, Lay your Hand on your Heart, and ask your ſelf, Whether the encouraging all manner of Diviſions, be not endeavouring to introduce Confuſion? If there were in *England* Five Thouſand different Sects, has not your Lordſhip perſuaded them to be content with themſelves; not to value what they are told by other Communions; That if they are but ſincere, they need not have regard to any thing elſe? Is not this to introduce Confuſion? What is Confuſion, but Difference and Diviſion? And does not your Lordſhip plainly declare to the World, that there is no need of uniting? That there is no particular Way or Method, that can recommend us more to the Favour of God, than another? Has your Lordſhip ſo much as given the leaſt Hint, that it's better to be in the Communion of the Church of *England*, than not? Have you not expoſed her Sacraments and Clergy; and as much as lay in you, broke down every thing in her, that diſtinguiſhes her from Fanatical Conventicles? What is there in her, as a Church, that you left untouch'd? What have you left in her, that can any way invite others into her

† *Anſwer*, p. 47.

Com-

Communion? Are her Clergy authorized more than others? For fear that should be thought, you make a Regular Succession from Christ, a *Trifle*. Are her Sacraments more regularly administred? Least that should recommend her, you slight the *Nullity or Validity of God's Ordinances*. Is there any Authority in her Laws, which enjoyn Communion with her? Least this should be believed, you tell us, that our being or continuing in any particular Method (or particular Communion) cannot recommend us more to the Favour of God than another.

I must observe to your Lordship, that these Opinions are very odly put in a *Preservative from ill Principles*; or, *an Appeal to the Consciences and Common Sence of the Laity*. Are they to be perswaded not to joyn with the Nonjurors, because no particular Priests, no particular Sacraments, no particular Communion is any thing but a Dream and Trifle; and such things as no way recommend us to the Favour of God more than others? Are the Nonjurors only thus to be answer'd? Is the Establish'd Church thus to be defended? Your Lordship, indeed, has not minc'd the matter: But, I hope, the Church of *England* is to be supported upon better Principles, or not at all.

If I should tell a Person that put a Case of Conscience to me, that all Cases of Conscience are Trifles, and signifie nothing; it would be plain, that I had given him a direct Answer: But if he had either Conscience or common Sence, he would seek out a better Confessor.

Your

Your Lordſhip tells Dr. *Snape*, that he ſaith and unſaith, to the *great Diverſion of the Roman Catholicks* [3]. But if your Lordſhip would unſay ſome things you have ſaid, it would be a greater Mortification to them, than all that ever you ſaid or writ in your Life.

To deny the Neceſſity of any particular Communion, to expoſe the Validity of Sacraments, and rally upon the Uninterrupted Succeſſion of Prieſts, and pull down every Pillar in the Church of Chriſt, is an Errand on which *Rome* hath ſent many Meſſengers. And the Papiſts are no more provoked with your Lordſhip for theſe Diſcourſes, than they were angry at *William Penn*, a reputed Jeſuite, for preaching up *Quakeriſm*. So long as they rejoyce in our Diviſions, or are glad to ſee the City of God made a mere *Babel*, they can no more be angry at your Lordſhip, than at your Advocates.

Dr. *Snape* ſays, you repreſent the Church of Chriſt as a Kingdom, in which Chriſt neither acts himſelf, nor hath inveſted any one elſe with Authority to act for him. At this your Lordſhip cries, P. 22. *Lay your Hand upon your Heart, and ask, Is this a Chriſtian, Human, Honeſt Repreſentation of what your own Eyes read in my Sermon?*

My Lord, I have dealt as ſincerely with my Heart as it is poſſible; and I muſt confeſs, I take the Doctor's Repreſentation to be Chriſtian and Honeſt. For tho' you ſometimes contend againſt Abſolute and Indiſpenſable Authority; yet it is

---

[3] *Anſwer*, p. 46.

plain, that you ſtrike at all Authority, and aſſert, as the Doctor ſaith, that Chriſt hath not inveſted any one on Earth with an Authority to act for him.

Page 11. You expreſsly ſay, *That as to the Affairs of Conſcience and Eternal Salvation, Chriſt hath left no Viſible Human Authority behind him.*

Now, my Lord, is not this ſaying, that he has left no Authority at all? For Chriſt came with no other Authority Himſelf: But as to Conſcience and Salvation, he erected a Kingdom which related to nothing but Conſcience and Salvation: And therefore they who have no Authority as to Conſcience and Salvation, have no Authority at all in his Kingdom. Conſcience and Salvation are the only Affairs of that Kingdom.

Your Lordſhip denies, that any one has Authority in theſe Affairs; and yet you take it ill to be charged with aſſerting, that Chriſt hath not inveſted any one with Authority for him. How can any one act for him, but in his Kingdom? How can they act in his Kingdom, if they have nothing to do with Conſcience and Salvation, when his Kingdom is concerned with nothing elſe?

Again, P. 16. your Lordſhip ſaith, that no one of them (Chriſtians) *any more than another, hath Authority either to make new Laws for Chriſt's Subjects, or to impoſe a Senſe upon the old ones; or to Judge, Cenſure or Puniſh the Servants of another Maſter, in Matters purely relating to Conſcience.*

I can meet with no Divine, my Lord, either Juror or Non-Juror, High or Low, Churchman or Diſſenter, that does not think your Lordſhip has plainly aſſerted in theſe Paſſages, what the Doctor has laid to your Charge, *that no one is inveſted with Authority from Chriſt to act for him.*

Your Lordſhip thinks, this is ſufficiently anſwer'd, by ſaying, you contend againſt an Abſolute Authority. You do indeed, ſometimes joyn Abſolute with that Authority you diſclaim. But, my Lord, it is ſtill true, that you have taken all Authority from the Church: For the Reaſons you every where give againſt this Authority, conclude as ſtrongly againſt any Degrees of Authority, as that which is truly Abſolute.

Firſt, You diſown the Authority of any Chriſtians over other Chriſtians; becauſe they are the *Servants of another Maſter* (p. 16.) Now this concludes as ſtrongly againſt *any* Authority, as that which is *Abſolute*: For no one can have the leaſt Authority over thoſe that are entirely under another's Juriſdiction. A ſmall Authority over another's Servant, is as inconſiſtent, as the greateſt.

2*dly*, You reject this Authority, becauſe of the Objects it is exerciſed upon, *i. e.* Matters purely relating to Conſcience and Salvation. Here this Authority is rejected, becauſe it relates to *Conſcience* and *Salvation*; which does as well exclude every Degree of Authority, as that which is Abſolute. For if Authority and Conſcience cannot ſuit together, Conſcience rejects

Authority, *as ſuch*; and not becauſe there is this or that Degree of it. So that this Argument baniſhes all Authority.

3*dly*, Your Lordſhip denies any Church-Authority; becauſe Chriſt doth not *interpoſe to convey Infallibillity, to aſſert the true Interpretation of his own Laws* *. Now, this Reaſon concludes as full againſt *all Authority*, as that which is *Abſolute*. For if Infallibility is neceſſary to found an Obedience upon in Chriſt's Kingdom, it's plain, that no body in Chriſt's Kingdom hath any Right to any Obedience from others, nor conſequently, any Authority to command it; no Members, or Number of Members of it, being infallible.

4*thly*, Another Reaſon your Lordſhip gives againſt Church-Authority, is this; *That it is the taking Chriſt's Kingdom out of his Hands, and placing it in their own*, (p. 14.) Now this Reaſon proves as much againſt Authority in general, or *any Degrees* of it, as that which is *Abſolute*. For if the Authority of others is inconſiſtent with Chriſt's being King of his own Kingdom, then *every Degree* of Authority ſo far as it extends, is an Invaſion of ſo much of Chriſt's Authority, and uſurping upon his Right.

---

* *Sermon*, p. 15.

The Reaſon likewiſe which your Lordſhip gives to prove the Apoſtles not Uſurpers of Chriſt's Authority, plainly condemns every Degree of Authority which any Church can now pretend to. *They were no Uſurpers, becauſe he then interpoſed to convey Infallibility; and was in all that they ordained: So that the Authority was his in the ſtricteſt Senſe* †. So that where he does not interpoſe, to convey Infallibility, there every *Degree* of Authority is a *Degree* of Uſurpation; and conſequently, the preſent Church having no Infallibility, has no Right to exerciſe the *leaſt Degree* of Authority, without robbing Chriſt of his Prerogative.

Thus it plainly appears, That every Reaſon you have offered againſt Church-Authority, concludes with as much Strength, againſt *all* Authority, as that which is *Abſolute*. And therefore Dr. *Snape* has done you no Injury in charging you with the Denial of *All* Authority.

There happens, My Lord, to be *only* this Difference between your Sermon and the Defence of it, that That is ſo many Pages againſt Church-Authority, *as ſuch*, and This is a Confutation of the *Pope's Infallibility*. It is very ſtrange, that ſo *Clear a Writer*, who has been ſo long enquiring into the Nature of *Government*, ſhould not be able to make himſelf be underſtood upon it: That your Lordſhip ſhould be only preaching againſt the Pope; and yet

† *Anſwer*, p. 38.

All

All the Lower House of Convocation should unanimously conceive, that your Doctrine therein deliver'd, tended to *subvert all Governments and Discipline in the Church of Christ*.

And, my Lord, it will appear from what follows, that your Lordship is even of same Opinion your self; and that you imagin'd, you had banish'd *all* Authority, *as such*, out of the Church, by those Arguments you had offered against an *Absolute Authority*. This is plain, from the following Passage; where you ridicule *that* which Dr. *Snape* took to be *an Authority*, though not Absolute. When Dr. *Snape* said, That no Church-Authority was to be obeyed in any thing contrary to the Reveal'd Will of God, your Lordship triumphs thus: *Glorious Absolute Authority, indeed, in your own Account, to which Christ's Subjects owe no Obedience, till they have examined into his own Declarations; and then they obey not this Authority, but him* *.

Here you make nothing of that Authority which is not *Absolute*; and yet you think it hard to be told, that you have taken away all *Church-Authority*. That which is Absolute, you expressly deny; and here you say, that which is not Absolute, is nothing at all. Where then is the *Authority* you have left? Or how is it that Christ has impower'd any one to act in his Name?

* *Answer*, p. 27.

Your

Your Lordſhip fights ſafe under the Protection of the Word *Abſolute*; but your Aim is at all Church-Power. And your Lordſhip makes too haſty an Inference, that becauſe it is not *Abſolute*, it is none at all. If you ask, where you have made this Inference, it is on occaſion of the above-mentioned Triumph; where your Lordſhip makes it an inſignificant Authority, which is only to be obey'd ſo long as it is not contrary to Scripture.

Your Lordſhip ſeems to think, all is loſt, as to Church-Power; becauſe the Doctor does not claim an *Abſolute one*; but allows it to be ſubject to Scripture: As if *all* Authority was *Abſolute*, or elſe nothing at all. I ſhall therefore conſider the Nature of this Church-Power, and ſhew, that though it is not *Abſolute*, yet it is a *Real Authority*, and is not ſuch a mere Notion as your Lordſhip makes it.

An *Abſolute Authority*, according to your Lordſhip, is, what is to be always obeyed by every Individual that is ſubject to it, in all Circumſtances. This is an Authority that we utterly deny to the Church. But, I preſume, there may be an *Authority* inferiour to this, which is nevertheleſs, a *Real Authority*, and is to be eſteemed as ſuch, and that for theſe Reaſons:

Firſt, I hope, it will be allow'd me, that our Saviour came into the World with Authority. But it was not lawful for the *Jews* to receive him, if they thought his Appearance not agreeable to thoſe Marks and Characters they had of him in their Scriptures. May I not here

here say, my Lord, *Glorious Authority of Christ indeed; to which the Jews ow'd no Obedience, till they had examined their Scriptures; and then they obey, not Him, but Them!*

Again, The Apostles were sent into the World with Authority: But yet, those who thought their Doctrines unworthy of God, and unsuitable to the Principles of Natural Religion, were obliged not to obey them. *Glorious Authority indeed, of the Apostles, to whom Mankind ow'd no Obedience, till they had, First, examin'd their own Notions of God and Religion; and then they obeyed, not the Apostles, but Them.*

I hope, my Lord, it may be allow'd, that the Sacraments are Real Means of Grace: But it is certain, they are only *conditionally* so, if those that partake of them, are endowed with suitable Dispositions of Piety and Vertue. *Glorious Means of Grace of the Sacraments, which is only obtained by such pious Dispositions; and then it is owing to the* Dispositions, *and not the* Sacraments. Now, my Lord, if there can be such a thing as instituted *Real* Means of Grace, which are only *conditionally apply'd*, I cannot see, why there may not be an instituted Real Authority in the Church, which is only to be *conditionally* obey'd.

Your Lordship has written a great many Elaborate Pages to prove the *English* Government Limited; and that no Obedience is due to it, but whilst it preserves our Fundamentals; and, I suppose, the People are to judge for them-

themſelves, whether theſe are ſafe, or not. *Glorious Authority of the* Engliſh *Government, which is to be obeyed no longer than the People think it their Intereſt to obey it.*

Will your Lordſhip ſay, There is *no Authority* in the *Engliſh* Government, becauſe only a *Conditional Obedience* is due to it, whilſt we think it ſupports our Fundamentals? Why then muſt the *Church-Authority* be reckoned nothing at all, becauſe only a *Rational Conditional* Obedience is to be paid, whilſt we think it not contrary to Scripture? Is a Limited, Conditional Government in the State, ſuch a Wiſe, Excellent, and Glorious Conſtitution? And is the ſame Authority in the Church, ſuch Abſurdity, Nonſence, and nothing at all, as to any actual Power?

If there be ſuch a thing as Obedience upon Rational Motives, there muſt be ſuch a thing as Authority that is not Abſolute, or that does not require a *Blind, Implicit* Obedience. Indeed, Rational Creatures can obey no other Authority; they muſt have Reaſons for what they do. And yet becauſe the Church claims only this *Rational* Obedience, your Lordſhip explodes *ſuch* Authority as none at all.

Yet it muſt be granted, that *no other* Obedience was due to the *Prophets*, or our *Saviour* and his *Apoſtles*: They were only to be obey'd by thoſe who Thought their Doctrines *worthy* of God. So that if the Church has *no* Authority, becauſe we muſt firſt conſult the Scriptures, before we obey it; neither our Saviour, nor his Apoſtles, had *any Authority*, be-

cause the *Jews* were first to consult their Scriptures, and the *Heathen* their Reason, before they obey'd 'em. And yet this is all that is said against *Church-Authority*; That because they are to judge of the *Lawfulness* of its Injunctions, therefore they owe it no Obedience: Which false Conclusion, I hope, is enough expos'd.

If we think it unlawful to do any thing that the Church requires of us, we must not obey its Authority. So, if we think it unlawful to submit to any Temporal Government, we are not to comply. But, I hope, it will not follow, that the Government has *no Authority*, because some think it unlawful to comply with it. If we are so unhappy as to judge wrong in any matter of Duty, we must nevertheless act according to our Judgments; and the Guilt of Disobedience either in *Church* or *State*, is more or less, according as our Error is more or less voluntary, and occasioned by our own Mismanagement.

I believe, I have shewn, First, that all your Lordship's Arguments against *Church-Authority*, conclude with the same Force against *all* Degrees of Authority: Secondly, That tho' *Church-Authority* be not Absolute in a *certain Sence*; yet if our Saviour and his Apostles had any Authority, the Church may have a *Real Authority*: For neither he nor his Apostles had *such* an Absolute Authority, as excludes all *Consideration* and *Examination*: Which is your Notion of *Absolute* Authority.

Before

Before I leave this Head, I muſt obſerve, that in this very Anſwer to Dr. *Snape*, where you would be thought to have expoſed *this Abſolute* Authority *alone*, you exclude *all* Authority along with it. You ask the Dr. * *Is this the whole you can make of it, after all your boaſted Zeal for* Mere Authority? You then ſay, *Why may I not be allowed to ſay, no Man on Earth hath an* Abſolute Authority, *as well as you*? My Lord, There can be no underſtanding of this, unleſs *Mere Authority* and *Abſolute Authority* be taken for the ſame thing by your Lordſhip.

But, my Lord, is not the ſmalleſt *Particle* of Matter, *Mere Matter*? And is it therefore the ſame as the *Whole Maſs* of Matter? Is an Inch of Space, becauſe it is *mere Space*, the ſame as *Infinite* Space? How comes it then, that *Mere* Authority is the ſame as *Abſolute* Authority? My Lord, *Mere* Authority implies *only* Authority, as a *Mere* Man implies *only* a Man: But your Lordſhip makes no Difference between *this*, and Abſolute Authority; and therefore hath left *no* Authority in the Church, unleſs there be Authority, that is not *Mere Authority*, i. e. Matter that is not *Mere Matter*; or Space that is not *Mere Space*.

When the Church enjoyns Matters of Indifference, is ſhe obey'd for any Reaſon, but for her *Mere* Authority? But your Lordſhip allows no Obedience to *Mere Authority*; and therefore no Obedience even in Indifferent Matters.

---

* *Anſwer*, p. 26.

Thus do these Arguments of yours lay all waste in the Church: And I must not omit one, my Lord, which falls as heavy upon the *State*, and makes all *Civil Government* unlawful. Your Words are these: *As the Church of Christ is the Kingdom of Christ, He himself is King; and in this it is imply'd, that He is the* sole *Law-giver to his* Subjects, *and Himself the* sole *Judge of their Behaviour in the Affairs of Conscience and Salvation.* If there be any *Truth* or Force in this Argument, it concludes with the same *Truth* and *Force* against all Authority in the *Kingdoms* of this World. In Scripture we are told, *the Most High ruleth in the Kingdom of Men* (Dan. 4. 17.) *that the Lord is our Law-giver, the Lord is our King,* (Isa. 33. 22.) Now, if because Christ is *King* of the Church, it must be in *this imply'd*, that he is *sole* Law-giver to his *Subjects*; it is plain to a Demonstration, that because *God* is *King* and *Law-giver* to the whole Earth, that therefore *He* is *sole Law-giver* to his *Subjects*; and consequently, that *all Civil Authority, all Human Laws*, are mere *Invasions* and *Usurpations* upon God's Authority, as *King* of the whole Earth.

Is no body to have any Jurisdiction in *Christ's Kingdom, because* He is *King* of it? How then comes any one to have *any* Authority in the *Kingdoms* of this World, when God has declar'd himself the *Law-giver*, and *King* of the whole World? Will your Lordship say, that Christ hath left us the *Scriptures*, as the *Statute-Laws* of his *Kingdom*, to pervert the Necessity of *After-Laws*? It may be answer'd,

That

That God has given us *Reason* for our Conſtant Guide; which, if it were as duly attended to, would as *certainly* anſwer the Ends of *Civil Life*, as the Obſervance of the Scriptures would make us Good Chriſtians.

But, my Lord, as Human Nature, if left to it ſelf, would neither anſwer the *Ends* of a *Spiritual* or *Civil* Society; ſo a *conſtant Viſible* Government in both, is *equally* neceſſary: And, I believe, it appears to all unprejudic'd Eyes, that in this Argument *at leaſt*, your Lordſhip has declar'd both *equally Unlawful*.

Your Lordſhip ſaith, † *The Excluſion of the Papiſts from the Throne, was not upon the account of their Religion.* Three Lines after you ſay, *I have contended indeed, elſewhere, that it was their unhappy Religion which* alone *made them uncapable in themſelves, of Governing this Proteſtant Nation, by the Laws of the Land.* My Lord, I can't reconcile theſe Two Paſſages. *Popery alone*, you ſay, was their *Incapacity*. From which it may be infer'd, they had *no other Incapacity*. Yet your Lordſhip ſaith, They were not excluded upon the Account of their *Religion*. A little after, you ſay, *The Ground of their Excluſion was not their Religion, conſider'd* as ſuch; *but the Fatal, Natural, Certain Effects of it upon themſelves to our Deſtruction.*

As for Inſtance; your Lordſhip may mean thus: If a *Man* of a *great Eſtate* dies, he loſes his *Right* to his Eſtate; not upon the Account

† *Anſwer*, p. 25.

of

of Death, consider'd, *as such*; but for the Certain, *Fatal, Natural* Effect of it upon himself. Or, suppose a Person be excluded for being an *Idiot*; it is not for his Idiocy, consider'd *as such*; but for the *Certain, Fatal, Natural Effect of it* upon himself to our Destruction.

My Lord, This is prodigious deep: I wish it be clear; or, that it be not too refin'd a Notion for common Use on this Subject. Likewise I do not conceive, my Lord, what you can call the *Fatal, Natural, Certain Effects* of any one's Religion. I am sure, among Protestants there are no *Natural, Certain Effects* of their Religion upon them; that their Practices don't *Fatally* follow their Principles: Neither is there any demonstrative Certainty, that a *Bishop* can't be against *Episcopacy*.

If the *Papists* are so *unalterably sincere* in their Religion, that we can prove their *certain* Observation of it, it's pity but they had our Principles, and we had their Practice. I have not that good Opinion of the Papists, which your Lordship hath: I believe, several of them sit as loose to their Religion, *as other Folks*.

Does your Lordship think, that all Papists are alike? That Natural Temper, Ambition and Education, don't make as much Difference amongst them, as the *same things* do amongst us? Are all Protestants loose and libertine alike? Why should all Papists be the same Zealots? If not, my Lord, then these *Effects* you call *Fatal, Natural* and *Certain*, may be not to be depended upon.

Your

Your Lordſhip knows, that it was generally believed, that King *Charles* the Second was a Papiſt: But I never heard of any *Fatal, Natural, and Certain Effects of his Religion upon him.* All that one hears of it is, that he liv'd like a Proteſtant, and dy'd like a Papiſt. I ſuppoſe, your Lordſhip will allow, that ſeveral who were lately Papiſts, are now true Proteſtants. I deſire therefore to know, what is become of the *Fatal, Certain, and Natural Effects of their Religion?*

My Lord, I beg of you to lay your Hand again upon your Heart, and ask, Whether this be ſtrict Reaſoning? Whether it is poſſible in the very Nature of the thing, *that ſuch Fatal, Natural, and Certain Effects* ſhould follow ſuch a *Giddy, Whimſical, Uncertain* Thing, as *Human and Free Choice?* My Lord, is it neither poſſible for Papiſts to change or conceal their Religion for Intereſt, or leave it through a Conſcientious Conviction? If the former is impoſſible, then, according to your Lordſhip, it is the *ſafeſt Religion* in the World; becauſe they are all ſure of being *ſincere*, and conſequently, the Firſt Favourites of God. If the latter is impoſſible, then a great many fine Sermons and Diſcourſes have been written to as wiſe Purpoſes, as if they had been directed to the Wind.

I come now to your Lordſhip's Definition of *Prayer*, a *Calm and Undiſturbed Addreſs to God.* It ſeems very ſtrange, that ſo great a Maſter of Words as your Lordſhip, ſhould pick out Two ſo very exceptionable, that all your Lordſhip's Skill could not defend them; but by leaving their firſt and Obvious Sence. Who would

would not take *Calm* and *Undiſturb'd* to be very like *Quiet* and *Unmov'd*? Yet your Lordſhip diſlikes thoſe Expreſſions. But if theſe do not give us a true *Idea* of *Prayer*, you have made a very narrow Eſcape, and have given us a Definition of *Prayer* as near to a *wrong one* as poſſible.

Prayer chiefly conſiſteth of *Confeſſion* and *Petition*. Now, to be *Calm*, and free from all *Worldly Paſſions*, is a neceſſary Temper to the right Diſcharge of ſuch Duties: But why our *Confeſſion* muſt be ſo *Calm*, and free from all *Perturbation* of Spirit; why our *Petitions* may not have all that Fervour and Warmth, with which either *Nature* or *Grace* can ſupply them, is very ſurprizing.

My Lord, we are adviſed to be *Dead to the World*; and I humbly ſuppoſe, no more is *implied* in it, than to keep our Affections from being too much engaged in it; and that a *Calm Undiſturbed*, i. e. *Diſpaſſionate* Uſe of the World is very *conſiſtent* with our being dead to it. If ſo, then this *Calm Undiſturb'd Addreſs to Heaven*, is a kind of *Prayer* that is very conſiſtent with our being *dead to Heaven*.

We are forbid to *love* the World; and yet no greater *Abſtraction* from it is requir'd, than to uſe it *Calm* and *Undiſturb'd*. We are commanded to *ſet our Affections on Things above*; and yet, according to your Lordſhip, the *ſame Calm Undiſturb'd Temper is enough*. According to this therefore, we are to be *affected* or rather *unaffected* alike, with *this* and the *next* World; ſince we are to be *Calm* and *Undiſturb'd* with reſpect to *both*.

The Reason your Lordship offers for this *Definition of Prayer*, is this; because you * *look upon Calmness and Undisturbedness to be the* Ornament and Defence *of Human Understanding in all its Actions.* My Lord, this plainly supposes, there is no such thing as the *Right Use* of our *Passions*: For if we could ever use them to any Advantage, then it could not be the Ornament of our Nature to be *dispassionate alike* in *all* its Actions. It is as much the *Ornament* and *Defence* of our Nature, to be differently *affected* with Things according to their *respective* Differences, as 'tis to understand or conceive *different Things* according to their real Difference. It would be no *Ornament* or *Credit* to us, to conceive no Difference betwixt a *Mountain* and a *Mole-Hill*: And our Rational Nature is as much disgrac'd when we are no more *affected* with *great* Things than with *small*. It is the Essential *Ornament* of our Nature, to be as sensibly *affected* in a different Manner with the different Degrees of Goodness of Things, as 'tis to perceive exactly the different *Natures* or Relations of Things. *Passion* is no more a Crime, *as such*, than the *Understanding* is, *as such*. 'Tis nothing but mistaking the *Value* of Objects, that makes it criminal. An *Infinite Good* cannot be too *passionately* desir'd; nor a *Real Evil* too *vehemently* abhorr'd. *Mere Philosophy*, my Lord, would teach us, that the Dignity of *Human Nature* is best declared by a *Pungent Uneasiness* for the *Misery* of Sin, and a *passionate warm Application* to Heaven for Assistance.

---

* *Answer*, p. 11.

Let us now consult the Scripture. St. *Paul* describes a *Godly Sorrow* something different from your Lordship's *Calm* and *Undisturbed Temper*, in these Words: *When ye sorrowed after a Godly sort, what* Carefulness *it wrought in you! Yea, what* Indignation, *yea, what* Fear, *yea, what* Zeal, *yea, what* Revenge! (2 *Cor.* 7. 11) My Lord, I suppose, *these* are not so many Words for *Calm* and *Undisturbed*. Yet, as different as they are, the Apostle makes them the *Qualities* of a *Godly Sorrow*. And all this, at the Expence of that *Calmness* which your Lordship terms the *Ornament* of Human Nature. Dr. *Snape* pleads for the *Fervency* and *Ardour* of our Devotions, from our *Saviour's praying more earnestly* before his *Passion*.

Your Lordship replies, that *this* can give no Direction as to our *daily Prayers*; because it was what our *Saviour* himself knew nothing of, but this once. The Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* knew nothing of this way of Reasoning. For as an Argument for *daily Patience*, he bids us, look to *Jesus*, who endured the *Cross*, because he died for us, leaving us an *Example*.

Our Saviour, my Lord, *suffered* and *died* but *once*: Yet is it made a Reason for our *daily Patience*, and propos'd as an Example for us to imitate.

If therefore, my Lord, his Passion, so *extraordinary* in it self, and as much above the Power of Human Nature to bear, as the *Intenseness* of his Devotions *exceeded* our Capacities for Prayer, be yet proposed as an *Example* to us in the *ordinary* Calamities of Life; how comes it, that this *Devotion* at that time should have no manner of Use or Direction in it as to our Devotions, especially in our *Distress*? How comes it, that his Suffering

should

ſhould have ſo much of *Example* in it, ſo much to be imitated; but the Manner of his *Devotion* then have nothing of Inſtruction, nothing that need be imitated by us? All the Reaſon that is offer'd, is the *Singularity* and *Extraordinarineſs* of it, when the ſame may be ſaid of his *Paſſion*; yet that is allow'd to be an *Example*.

Your Lordſhip is pleaſed, for the Information of your *Unwary Readers*, to reaſon thus upon the Place: *If this be the Example of our Saviour*, to aſſure us of his *Will about the Temper* neceſſary *to* Prayer, *it will follow, that our Bleſſed Lord Himſelf never truly prayed before this time: And yet again, if he prayed more earneſtly, it will follow, that he had prayed before; and conſequently, that this Temper in which He now was, was not* neceſſary *to* Prayer.

My Lord, one would think, this Elaborate Proof was againſt ſomething aſſerted. Here you have indeed, a thorough Conqueſt; but it is over *no body*. For did any one ever aſſert, that ſuch *Extraordinary Earneſtneſs* was neceſſary to Prayer? Does Dr. *Snape*, or any Divines allow of no Prayers, except we ſweat *Drops of Blood*? Will your Lordſhip ſay, that the *Neceſſity* of this Temper is imply'd in the Quotation of this Text, as a Direction for Prayer? I anſwer, juſt as much, as we are all oblig'd to die upon the *Croſs*, becauſe his *Sufferings* there are propoſed to us as an *Example*.

The plain Truth of the Matter, my Lord, I take to be this: Our *Saviour's Sufferings* on the Croſs were ſuch as no Mortal can undergo; yet they are juſtly propoſed as an *Example* to us to bear with Patience ſuch Sufferings as are

within the Compass of Human Nature. His Earnest Devotion before this Passion, far exceeded any *Fervours* which the Devoutest of Mankind can attain to: Yet it is justly proposed to us as an *Example*, to excite us to be as Fervent as we can; and may be justly alleg'd in our Defence, when our *warm* and *passionate* Addresses to God in our Calamities, are condemn'd as *superstitious Folly*. My Lord, must nothing be an *Example*, but what we can exactly come up to? How then can the *Life* of our *Saviour*, which was entirely free from *Sin*, be an Example to us? How could it be said in the Scripture, *Be ye holy, for I am holy*? Can any one be *Holy* as *God is*?

My Lord, one might properly urge the *Practice* of the Primitive Christians, who parted with *all* they had for the Support of their *Indigent Brethren*, as an Argument for Charity, without designing to oblige People to part with all they have. And *he* that should, in answer to such an Argument, tell the World, that *Charity* is only a *calm undisturb'd Good Will to all Mankind*, would just as much set forth the *true Doctrine of Charity*, as He that defines Prayer to be a *Calm and undisturb'd Address to Heaven*, for no other Reason, but because no *certain* Degrees of Fervour or Affection are necessarily requir'd to constitute Devotion. My Lord, has *Charity* nothing to do with the *Distribution of Alms*, because no certain Allowance is fix'd? Why then must *Prayer* have nothing to do with *Heat* and *Fervency*, because no fix'd Degrees of it are necessary?

There-

Therefore, my Lord, as I would define *Charity* to be a Pious Diſtribution of ſo much of our Goods to the Poor, as is ſuitable to our Circumſtances; ſo I would define *Prayer*, an *Addreſs to Heaven, enliven'd with ſuch Degrees of Fervour and* Intenſeneſs *as our* Natural Temper, *influenc'd with a true Senſe of God, ſhould beget in us.*

Your Lordſhip ſays, you only deſire to ſtrike at the Root of *Superſtitious Folly*, and *ſubſtitute Prayer in its room*; And this is to be effected by making our Addreſſes *calm and undiſturb'd*: By which we are to underſtand, a *Freedom* from *Heat* and *Paſſion*, as your Lordſhip explains it, by an Application to your ſelf.

If therefore, any one ſhould happen to be ſo *diſturb'd* at his Sins, as to offer a *Broken* and *Contrite Heart* to God, inſtead of one *calm* and *undiſturb'd*; or, like Holy *David*, his Soul ſhould be athirſt for God, or pant after him, as the *Hart panteth after the Water-Brooks*, this would not be *Prayer*, but *Superſtitious Folly*.

My Lord, *Calmneſs* of *Temper*, as it ſignifies a Power over our *Paſſions*, is a *Happy Circumſtance* of a *Rational Nature*, but no farther: When the Object is well choſen, there is no Danger in the Purſuit.

The Calmneſs your Lordſhip hath deſcribed, is fit for a *Philoſopher* in his *Study*, who is ſolving *Mathematical* Problems. But if he ſhould come abroad into the World, thus entirely empty of all Paſſion, he would live to as much purpoſe, as if he had left his Underſtanding behind him.

What

What a fine Subject, my Lord, would such a one make, who, when he heard of *Plots, Invasions and Rebellions*, would continue as *calm* and *undisturb'd*, as when he was *comparing Lines and Figures*? Such a Calm Subject would scarce be taken for any *Great Loyalist*.

Your Lordship in other Places, hath recommended an *open* and *undisguised Zeal* *, and told us such things as ought to *alarm the coldest Heart* †. Sure, my Lord, this is somewhat more than *Calm* and *Undisturb'd*: And will your Lordship, who hath expressed so much Concern for this *Ornament and Defence of Human Understanding*, persuade us to part with the least Degree of it upon any account? I am, my Lord, (with all Respect that is due to your Lordship's Station and Character)

Your most Humble and

Obedient Servant,

William Law.

---

* *Serm. 5th Nov. p. 5.*
† *Serm. p. 14.*

FINIS.

BOOKS Printed for *W.* and *J. INNYS.*

REmarks upon the Lord Bishop of *Bangor's* Sermon, entituled, *The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church of Christ.* Humbly addrest'd to his Lordship. By *Robert Marsden*, B.D. Archdeacon of *Nottingham*, and late Fellow of *Jesus College* in *Cambridge*. The Third Edit. 1717.

A Discourse of Schism; shewing, 1. What is meant by Schism. 2. That Schism is a Damnable Sin. 3. That there is a Schism between the Establish'd Church of *England* and the Dissenters. 4. That this Schism is to be charged on the Dissenters side. 5. That the Modern Pretences of Toleration, Agreement in Fundamentals, &c. will not excuse the Dissenters from being guilty of Schism. To which is annexed, an Answer to a Book, entituled, *Thomas against Bennet, or the Protestant Dissenters vindicated from the Charge of Schism.* By *Tho. Bennet*, D.D. Vicar of *St. Giles's Cripplegate*. The 4th Edition. 1718.

A Discourse of the Ever-blessed Trinity in Unity, with an Examination of Dr. *Clarke's* Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity. By *Tho. Bennet*, D.D. Vicar of *St. Giles's Cripplegate*. 8vo.

An Enquiry after Happiness, in Three Parts. 1. Of the Possibility of obtaining Happiness. 2. Of the True Notion of Human Life. 3. Of Religious Perfection. The 5th Edition, in 2 Vols. 8vo.

Practical Christianity: Or, An Account of the Holiness which the Gospel enjoyns; with the Motives to it, and the Remedies it proposes against Temptations: With a Prayer concluding each distinct Head. Both by *Rich. Lucas*, D.D. late Prebendary of *Westminster*.

The

Printed for W. and J. Innys

By the Reverend Dr. *Brett*. 8vo.

The Wisdom of God manifested in the Works of the Creation. In Two Parts. By John Ray, late Fellow of the Royal Society. The 7th Edition. 8vo.

The Christian's best Guide: Or, The Religious Man's Companion. 8vo.

Practical Discourses upon the Lord's Prayer, preach'd before the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn. By Tho. Manton, D.D. Prebendary of Westminster. 8vo.

Physico-Theology: Or, a Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God, from his Works of Creation; with large Notes, and many Curious Observations. By William Derham, Rector of Upminster in Essex, Canon of Windsor, and F.R.S. The 4th Edition. 8vo. 1716.

Astro-Theology: Or, a Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God, from a Survey of the Heavens. Illustrated with Copper Plates. The 3d Edition. 8vo. By the same Author. (In the Press.)

Three *Physico-Theological* Discourses, concerning, 1. The Chaotick State, and Creation of the World. 2. The General Deluge, its Causes and Effects. 3. The Dissolution of the World, and future Conflagration. Wherein are largely discussed, the Production and Use of Mountains; the Original of Fountains, of formed Stones, and Sea-Fishes found and Shells found in the Earth; the Effects of particular Floods, and Inundations of the Sea; the Eruptions of Vulcano's, the Nature and Causes of Earthquakes. Also an Historical Account of those two remarkable ones in *Jamaica* and *England*. With Practical Inferences. By John Ray, late F.R.S. The 3d Edition, illustrated with Copper Plates, and much more enlarged than the Former Editions, from the Author's own MSS. 8vo. 1713. *Publish'd by the Reverend Mr.* Derham.